AF/RW

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Dated: September 14, 2005 Signature: Carla Rivera
(Carla Rivera)

OIPE
SEP 16 2005
PATENT & TRADEMARK

Docket No.: 55219-00010USPT
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:
Ram Oron et al.

Application No.: 10/686126 Confirmation No.: 7639

Filed: October 15, 2003 Art Unit: 2839

For: OPTICAL TERMINATOR Examiner: J. H. Nasri

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED JULY 19, 2005**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

It has been noted that the following correction should be made in the second paragraph of the "Remarks" portion of the response filed August 29, 2005 in the above-identified application.

What figure 6 of the Japanese reference shows is **diffraction** of light impinging on a grating. Diffraction is wavelength dependent, whereas scattering is wavelength independent. Thus, the Japanese reference cannot anticipate claims 1-4, because the term "scattering" in the independent claim 1 cannot be properly construed to read on the diffracting grating disclosed in the Japanese reference. Attached as Exhibits A and B are copies of standard industry definitions of the words "scattering" and "diffraction" from *The Photonics* dictionary. These definitions make it clear that scattering does not change ~~the~~ with wavelength, but diffraction does. In fact, the definition of "scattering" in Exhibit A specifically states that "there is no change of